

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 25, 2008 the Office noted that claims 12-17 were pending and rejected claims 12-17. Claims 12, 13, 15 and 17 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, claims 18-20 are new, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 12-20 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections and objections are traversed below.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to. In particular, the Office asserts that the drawings do not show every feature of the invention as specified in the claims. The Applicant has amended the figures to include descriptive text labels.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The disclosure stands objected to for informalities. In particular, the Office states that the title of the invention is not descriptive. The Applicant has amended the title to recite "HOLOGRAM RECORDING APPARATUS, AND HOLOGRAM RECORDING/REPRODUCING APPARATUS."

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claims 12, 13 and 15 stand objected to for informalities. In particular, the Office asserts that the term "plate-like laser beam" is unclear.

The claims have been amended to recite "tabular laser beam." The Applicant submits that a tabular laser beam is supported by a plate-like laser beam in the Specification and that no new matter has been added.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Itoh, U.S. Patent No. 7,023,786 in view of Braitberg, U.S. Patent No. 3,976,354. The Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the rejection with an argument.

Itoh discusses a hologram recording medium made of a photorefractive crystal having a parallel plate shape.

Braitberg discusses one dimensional Fourier transform holograms having their elongated dimension oriented in a direction which is essentially normal to the direction of motion of the memory medium.

On page 5 of the Office Action, it is acknowledged that Itoh does not disclose "combining optical system for combining the one-dimensional spatial modulated signal light and the reference light to a same optical path, in a subsequent step of

said one-dimensional spatial modulating device," as in claim 12, but that Braitberg, col. 4, lines 35-38 does.

However, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have looked to Braitberg to fill in the deficiencies of Itoh as Itoh teaches away from the combination with Braitberg. Itoh, col. 4, lines 1-9 discloses

A laser light beam 12 emitted from the light source 11 is split into a signal light beam 12a and a recording reference light beam 12b by a beam splitter 13. The signal light beam 12a and the recording reference light beam 12b are guided and irradiated to the same position P in a recording medium 10 **by way of different optical paths**, respectively.

Further, col. 4, lines 52-61 of Braitberg does not make it clear that combining the one-dimensional spatial modulated signal light and the reference light to a **same optical path** occurs. However, if it is disclosed in Braitberg, Itoh teaches away from the combination with it, as Itoh discusses the opposite of what the Office asserts Braitberg teaches.

Further, Itoh does not disclose the signal light beam 12a and the recording reference light beam 12b are combined to the same optical path. So there is significant difference between the present invention and Itoh. Owing to this feature of the present invention, "it is possible to contain a space occupied by the optical path of the plate-like laser beam and a space occupied by the one-dimensional spatial modulating device for spatial-modulating the plate-like laser beam, in a space which spreads relatively thinly along the recording surface. (see the above-mentioned Best Mode for Carrying Out the Invention).

For at least the reasons discussed above, Itoh and Braitberg, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claim 12 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 18-20 are new. Support for claim 18 may be found, for example, in ¶ 0085 of the printed publication version of the Specification. Support for claim 19 may be found, for example, in ¶¶ 0059 and 0060. Support for claim 20 may be found, for example, in ¶¶ 0015, 0016 and 0085. The Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by the amendment.

The prior art of record fails to anticipate or make obvious said combining the signal light and the reference light to a same optical path, by multiplexing the signal light and the reference light; recording the record information onto the recording medium such that an axial direction of a Fourier image is shifted from a radial direction of the disc-shaped recording medium; and emitting the laser beam such that a flat surface of the tabular laser beam is parallel to the recording surface.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is also submitted that

claims 12-20 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg. No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/lrs

APPENDIX:

The Appendix includes the following items:

- replacement drawing sheets for Figures 1, 8 and 9